



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/034,394

12/27/2001

Bryan Jeffery Moles

SAMS01-00175

1196

7590

02/09/2005

Docket Clerk
P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,394

Applicant(s)

MOLES, BRYAN JEFFERY

Examiner

Ryan F Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 4-5 "scanning a portion of markup language source" should be "for scanning a portion of a markup language source". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angiulo et al ("Angiulo", US 6,275,829) in view of Patil et al ("Patil", US 6,489,976).

As per independent claim 1, Angiulo discloses a converter for adapting markup language documents for display in small areas comprising: a conversion controller scanning a portion of markup language source selected for display for tags (Column 11 lines 20-33) associated with graphical elements and replacing each detected graphical element within the selected markup language source portion with one of a plurality of placeholders (Column 7 lines 28-38). Angiulo fails to distinctly point out reusable placeholders having labels corresponding to buttons. However, Patil teaches having

labels corresponding to a set of buttons (Column 4 lines 36-40), wherein the plurality of placeholders are reused to replace detected graphical elements within other portions of the markup language source when such other portions are selected for display (Lines 25-31). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine method of Anguilo with the current teaching of Patil. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a convenient way of initiating a link besides the conventional point and click method.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Anguilo fails to distinctly point out a physical switch for user control. However, Patil teaches wherein each button is a physical switch or display element functioning as a user control for initiating display of a graphical element replaced by a corresponding placeholder (Column 6 lines 17-25, Column 36-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine method of Anguilo with the current teaching of Patil. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a convenient way of initiating a link besides the conventional point and click method.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 3, Anguilo discloses a converter wherein the graphical elements replaced by one of the placeholders includes images, user controls, hyperlinks, tables, and animations (Column 2 lines 51-62).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 4, Anguilo discloses a converter wherein the conversion controller, responsive to selection of the markup language source portion for display, replaces a tag associated with each detected graphical element with a link to one of the placeholders (Column 11 lines 20-29).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Anguilo fails to disclose reusing the placeholders. However, Patil teaches a conversion controller, responsive to election of a different portion of the markup language source for display including a different set of graphical elements than the previously selected markup language portion (Column 5 lines 21-23), replaces a tag associated with each detected graphical element within the different markup language source portion with a link to one of the placeholders, thereby reusing placeholders for the different set of graphical elements (Column 5 lines 26-31; *order of presentation changed as order and content of icons change*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine method of Anguilo with the current teaching of Patil. Motivation to do so would have been so that the user interface is easily adaptable so that each access key can be reused with different links depending on their on screen positioning.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Anguilo discloses a converter wherein the conversion controller passes altered markup language source containing at least one link to one of the placeholders in place of a graphical element within the selected markup language source portion to a markup language interpreter for rendering and display (Column 7 lines 28-38; *proved hyperlink*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Anguilo-Patil discloses a converter wherein the actuation of a button corresponding to a placeholder within a displayed portion of the altered markup language source initiates display of the graphical element replaced by the corresponding placeholder (Patil, Column 6 lines 17-25, Column 6 lines 36-39).

Claims 8,15 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 9,16 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10,17 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11,18 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12,19 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,20 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14,21 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US006701350B1 teaches filtering a web page to filter out sections of web pages by parsing the HTML and removing/replacing tags.
- US 20040049737A1 teaches resizing replacing elements according to the client browser including small devices.

- US006049821A teaches a filtering service and changing page content according to browser requirements.
- US 20040064471A1 replacing elements on a page based on settings.
- Kamada teaches access keys and markup language definitions for small devices.
- Martin teaches access keys and linking through imode phones.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro

Application/Control Number: 10/034,394

Page 7

Art Unit: 2174

Art Unit 2174

Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISOR/ART UNIT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100